

could pass out abortion pills like candy, Mr. Speaker. It is time for our third branch of government to step up now, show some common sense, and make the right decision to protect millions of our unborn babies.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I always remember a story that happened shortly before my momma left this Earth. She was in hospice, and she started talking to folks that had passed a long time before her: my daddy, her daddy, her brother who died in the Second World War. She was looking off at one point, and I said: "What are you looking at, Momma?" And she said: "Baby, I am looking at all of those sweet little babies over there."

I can't help but think some of those sweet little babies my sweet momma was looking at were some of the unborn that were murdered in abortion.

ECONOMIC CRISIS—RISING INFLATION

(Mr. ROSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, our Thanksgiving celebration for this year is in the rearview mirror, but the rising inflation that drove dinner costs higher this year is sticking around for Christmas and will continue to crush household budgets into the new year.

From the grocery store to the gas pump, Americans across the board are paying more for just about everything. No matter where you may fall on the income spectrum, none of us can escape paying more for less. However, lower income households and the elderly who are on fixed incomes will be hit hardest by the pain that inflation always inflicts.

What is driving the skyrocketing inflation? Wasteful and increased Federal spending that encourages workers to remain on the sidelines, supply chain shortages, and transportation disruptions are to blame.

Americans are not stupid. That is why a majority say that President Biden's multitrillion-dollar socialist tax-and-spend scheme will only make bad inflation worse, not better.

CONGRATULATING YOUNG HARRIS COLLEGE MEN'S SOCCER TEAM

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and celebrate the continued accomplishments of Young Harris College Men's Soccer team.

On November 14, the team rallied together to defeat Clayton State, securing their sixth Peach Belt Conference title in program history.

Furthermore, this victory advanced the team to the NCAA Division II National Tournament. Entering the tour-

namment with a 17-0-1 record, the Mountain Lions continued to dominate with a 2-1 win over the Clayton State Lakers for the title.

The team is now set to face off against Auburn University at Montgomery on December 2 in the quarterfinals of the Division II tournament.

These student athletes are to be celebrated for their spirit of unrelenting perseverance. Their hard work, dedication, and determination will be an example future teams will strive to emulate.

I extend my congratulations to the entire YHC Men's Soccer program for their remarkable season and am proud of my alma mater. Go Mountain Lions.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1237

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CROW) at 12 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6119, FURTHER EXTENDING GOVERNMENT FUNDING ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 829 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 829

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6119) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on a vote by the yeas and nays on the question of adoption of a motion that the House suspend the rules offered on the legislative day of November 30, 2021, or December 1, 2021, may be postponed through the legislative day of December 10, 2021.

SEC. 3. House Resolution 188, agreed to March 8, 2021 (as most recently amended by House Resolution 774, agreed to November 5, 2021), is amended by striking "December 3, 2021" each place it appears and inserting (in each instance) "January 21, 2022".

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding section 3 of this resolution, on any legislative day of the second session of the One Hundred Seventeenth Congress before January 10, 2022—

(a) the Speaker may dispense with organizational and legislative business; and

(b) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved if applicable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, today the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 829. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 6119 under a closed rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides that requested roll call votes on suspension bills considered on November 30, December 1, or December 2 may be postponed through December 10.

Finally, the rule provides for recess instruction suspension authority and same-day authority through January 21, 2022, and allowing the House to convene the second session of the 117th Congress on January 10, 2022.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to consider a continuing resolution to keep our government open and operating for the American people. A continuing resolution will allow the Appropriations Committee to complete its work on full-year appropriation bills and provide needed funding to many critical programs that help our small businesses, our veterans, our local governments, and so much more.

It is, frankly, a bit disturbing that we need a structured rule for this very basic function. I think it speaks volumes that the other side seems uninterested in engaging in our most essential responsibilities. I would say I was surprised but, sadly, this appears to be just another step in a long line of attempts to undermine needed accountability and investment this year.

In September, we passed a continuing resolution to keep the government open until December 3 and allow for the House and Senate to negotiate omnibus government funding legislation.

The other side has so far refused to negotiate for full-year funding bills.

They have refused to be responsible with the programs that so many of our constituents depend upon.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I know firsthand the impact that a lack of full-year funding will have.

Without full-year funding, we will not be able to help the VA reduce its backlog to help our veterans and their families.

We will not be able to provide our military with the funding to promote readiness, and we won't be able to provide a badly needed pay raise for our troops.

We also won't be able to help our small businesses, who continue to struggle because of the pandemic.

Those problems may be acceptable to the other side, but not to Democrats. As the economy continues to recover from the pandemic, this bill will ensure that we can keep the government open and avoid the disastrous consequences of the Republican-led 2018-2019 shutdown.

In the meantime, we hope Republicans will start the process of offering constructive proposals to address the critical issues facing our country. Our constituents deserve that much at the very least. I look forward to that discussion when it does occur.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), my good friend and not only fellow member of the Rules Committee, but fellow appropriator, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule covers one item, a continuing resolution to fund the government and keep it open and operating through February 18, 2022.

While I am grateful that we are taking steps to avoid a government shutdown, I am disappointed by the solution before us, yet another short-term funding bill with full-year funding negotiations no closer than they were a few months ago or a few weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, today's resolution is the second continuing resolution we have had to pass to cover fiscal year 2022. Sadly, I expect it will not be the last. This state of affairs was absolutely avoidable and reflects poorly on the Democratic leadership.

I have often said that government funding is the most fundamental responsibility of Congress. Unfortunately, we are nowhere close to a full-year appropriation funding deal. We are no closer to an agreement today than the last time we passed a continuing resolution in September. The reality is that the reason we are having to consider another continuing resolution today is because of the majority's insistence on focusing on partisan priorities rather than on the critical business of governing the nation.

□ 1245

For months, the majority's focus has not been anywhere near where it

should have been. Instead of reaching a full-year deal on government funding or even a top-line agreement on funding levels, the majority has insisted on working on other partisan matters.

Since the passage of the last stop-gap funding measure, House Democrats have focused solely on their massive reconciliation bill, month after month, focused on enshrining partisan policies into law. These efforts may satisfy their progressive base, but they fail the American people as a whole.

The majority currently controls the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, and if they can swing the votes, they can pass whatever they want into law. But with that ability also comes a grave responsibility, a responsibility to govern the country. Unfortunately, the majority has been abandoning that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, October 1 marked the beginning of fiscal year 2022. By rights, the House and the Senate should have both passed our standard 12 appropriations bills through both Chambers of Congress and into law by that date. But since we did not, a continuing resolution was necessary.

Now we are on the second continuing resolution of this fiscal year, and in all likelihood, a probable third one is coming in February, unless my friends on the other side actually start negotiating in earnest. At this point, we are unfortunately no closer to passing these 12 bills or an omnibus spending bill than we were back on October 1.

This is truly a failure to govern. While the majority focuses on a push to make the government bigger and bigger, they are failing to fund the government which already exists today.

What happens as a result? We move from continuing resolution to continuing resolution, getting no closer to a final spending deal. Not involving Republicans until the very last minute and just expecting us to indefinitely support CR after CR is no way to govern, and frankly, the failure to have any conversations about how to come to an agreement on a full-year appropriations bill is indefensible.

While I am sure former President Trump will be pleased to know his last budget continues on almost a year after he left office, there is real work that can and should be done.

But what is perhaps the most frustrating has been the way in which the majority has bungled reaching a relatively simple deal on this particular continuing resolution. Knowing full well that this Friday's deadline was coming up, the majority instead dithered for months on their reconciliation package.

This week, finally acknowledging that real discussions needed to be had with Republicans, the majority instead continued to twiddle their thumbs. Indeed, Republicans in the House were completely shut out of this process, leaving us all in the dark about the nature of today's bill until this morning. Once again, the majority has chosen to

go it alone rather than choosing to work across the aisle.

The majority is well aware that their current stance on a larger deal is dead on arrival in the Senate. As long as they continue to insist on omitting the historically bipartisan pro-life protections which have existed in law for more than 45 years, Republicans cannot and will not support bills that end these protections, and the Senate will not pass them.

But that is not the only point of disagreement. The majority has been unwilling to fund our Nation's defense at the levels agreed to by the authorizers and appropriators in the House and currently being debated in the Senate. These increased levels are necessary to ensure continued defense readiness worldwide, especially given the ongoing tensions in places like Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Afghanistan, and the Taiwan Strait.

But instead of governing and seeking to address these challenges, the majority is pandering to the most extreme elements of their Caucus, trying desperately to pass bills that lower defense spending levels and omitting key bipartisan pro-life protections from appropriations bills. And instead of governing, the majority holds the American people hostage under the threat of a government shutdown, dragging the country from one self-inflicted crisis to another.

Mr. Speaker, the sooner the majority gets serious about reaching a full-year deal, the better for the country. There are real, damaging consequences to the failure to pass full-year appropriations bills, both at home and abroad, and the sooner the majority brings its attention back to the critical business of governing the country, the better off we all will be.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I once again state that the failure of not being able to pass a timely budget lies at the feet of the Republican Party. They have refused to come to the table with actual fair negotiations.

If my colleagues across the aisle want to have a debate on a woman's right to choose what to do with their bodies, then I would welcome that.

I would also welcome a debate on issues like gun violence. If we care about life and we say that we are pro-life, we should be pro-life for everyone, including our high school students that are suffering every single day at the hands of the failure of this Republican Party to come to the table.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment on the rule to immediately bring up H.R. 6056, the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, education is one of the most important issues that we face today. Determining how our children will be educated determines the future fate of our Nation.

Unfortunately, many school districts have been ignoring the wishes of parents or, worse, telling parents they cannot play a role in their child's education.

Democratic gubernatorial candidate Terry McAuliffe made Democrats' position on education clear when he said: "I don't think parents should be telling schools what they should teach." I couldn't disagree with him more, and thankfully, neither could Virginia voters.

Instead, H.R. 6056, developed by Education and Labor Committee Republicans, would enshrine a list of rights into law to make clear to parents what their rights are and clear to schools what their duties to parents are.

These rights include the right to know what their children are being taught, the right of parents to be heard, and the right to protect their child's privacy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Louisiana (Ms. LETLOW), the sponsor of H.R. 6056 and a member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Ms. LETLOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so we can immediately take up H.R. 6056, the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

As a mom of two and a former educator, I can tell you from firsthand experience that education is not something that can happen without parents playing a role. The learning process requires both sides to work together and have collaborative partnerships that ensure a student's success.

Parents should not have a system of values and beliefs forced on their children or send them to school while fearing indoctrination by a political agenda. The idea that government can exclude parents and have total control of the classroom will never work because it ignores the simple truth that these are our children, not the government's.

The Parents Bill of Rights Act puts safeguards in place that ensure that the foundation of education is built on a meaningful dialogue between a family and their child's school. This bill has five core principles that are designed to create mutually beneficial partnerships and lead to greater collaboration.

Those five principles are: one, parents have the right to review their school's curriculum, reading materials, and State academic standards; two, parents have the right to lawfully en-

gage with their local school board and educators; three, parents have the right to see a school's budget and spending, including detailed information about revenues and expenditures; four, parents have the right to protect their child's privacy; and, finally, parents have the right to keep their child safe and be updated on any violent activity at school.

The ideas contained in this bill are not partisan or polarizing; they are simple and common sense. In my home State of Louisiana, a similar parents bill of rights passed with broad support from both Republicans and Democrats, and I hope we can follow suit here in Congress.

Several weeks ago, Louisiana's State Superintendent of Education, Dr. Cade Brumley, wrote about how family involvement is critical for educational success. He said: "It takes a family to raise a child. Schools exist to support that effort with a responsibility to provide a quality education in a safe environment."

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity today in this body to take a step forward for America's families, and I hope my colleagues across the aisle will join us in that effort.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I welcome a healthy debate on the future of our children while they are in school. A healthy debate will also include a responsible code of conduct, basic respect, and accountability issues.

It would also include accepting the fact that our children every single day are subject to gun violence, but yet, conspiracy theories in full display in Congress continue to deny our children and their parents the safety that they are demanding.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS), my good friend and ranking member of the Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education Subcommittee, for further explanation of the previous question.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6056, the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

As a father of six children and a grandfather of 15, I know from experience that parents who are informed and engaged are always the best advocates for their own children.

I also grew up in a home with teachers. My dad was a college professor for 40 years, and my mom was a junior high school teacher.

Recent attempts to discredit the role of parents and to silence their genuine concerns should be very concerning to every American. There has never been a time more important than now to stand with and for America's parents.

I have heard directly from Utah's moms and dads. They don't want Wash-

ington bureaucrats and career politicians dictating the decisions that determine the education, development, health, and well-being of their children. They want and deserve a say.

Democrats' and the leftist teachers unions' efforts to nationalize education, mandate curriculum, and impose one-size-fits-all models from D.C., while ignoring the will of teachers, parents, and students, have been extremely harmful.

This last year, we have seen the academic and emotional needs of young learners totally ignored. Keeping our children out of the classroom went against the science. It also went against good old-fashioned common sense.

Here are some sobering facts. During the 2020 through 2021 school year, students fell behind an average of 5 months in math and 4 months in reading. Low-income and minority children fell an additional 1 to 2 months behind their White and wealthy peers.

Even before the pandemic in 2017, the United States Department of Education found that 75 percent of Black boys in the State of California failed to pass standard reading and writing tests. In 2019, only 15 percent of Baltimore eighth grade students were proficient in reading, and about 10 percent were proficient in math.

This is beyond politics and party lines. It is about the future of our great Nation. It is about the success of our children.

There is an urgent need to raise the bar of education in our country. We cannot do this by pushing parents out of the driver's seat and ignoring academic needs for our students. Our Parents Bill of Rights will address both concerns.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Continuing conspiracy theories, the big lie, drove thousands of Americans to come to the U.S. Capitol in a violent attempt to overthrow our government. In full display today, once again we have Republicans that are continuing with their conspiracy theories about what is and isn't happening on our school grounds.

Well, let me tell you what is happening in some of the schools in my district.

For the very first time, under the Biden administration, children have access to healthy food. They have food programs. They are learning how to grow their own food.

For the very first time, families that spend hours driving to and from work, hardworking parents, have the relief of knowing that childcare is available for their children.

This is what is at stake today, the real issues of what is happening and not happening in our schools and access to education. It doesn't just take a healthy family to raise a child. In the words of the former first lady, sometimes it takes a village.

Vote on this CR. Fund the government and continue to fund healthy programs that help our children thrive in their schools.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), my very good friend and the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor, for further explanation on the previous question.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring up H.R. 6056, the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

There has been a push to silence parents around the country. Powerful teachers unions, several school boards, Democrat politicians, and the Biden Justice Department have all voiced opposition to the rights of parents to have a say in their child's education.

We will not stand for this kind of intimidation, and we will not tolerate the left's attempt to push parents out of the decisionmaking process when it comes to their child's education.

That is why we have introduced the Parents Bill of Rights. This legislation will protect rights parents already have but that are now under attack.

I can't imagine why anyone would oppose the Parents Bill of Rights Act. Making school spending and curriculum transparent should already be the norm. After all, what do schools have to hide?

This bill will also ensure that schools do not share or sell private student data or attempt to administer health examinations without parental consent. These are extremely important decisions that belong to parents, not bureaucrats or school administrators.

The left's assault on parental rights is outrageous. To claim that parents are akin to domestic terrorists just because they don't agree with the left's agenda is beyond the pale. Yet, it is these very attacks that have shown Americans all around the country just how important it is to stand up to the left. We cannot let our fundamental rights be stripped from us, especially the right to raise our children.

This bill is ushering in a new era of education, one where parents won't take a back seat to the system. One thing is certain, our children and the country will be better off for having the Parents Bill of Rights.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, by continuing to promote conspiracy theories and refusing to come to the table to talk about the real issues that we are funding here today, the Republicans in Congress continue to deny parents and children the education that they need by continuing to deny healthy food programs, once again.

So let's focus on what is healthy and not healthy for our children. Continuing to drink the Kool-Aid that led thousands of people to hurt our U.S. Capitol Police officers, to beat them with our own American flag, that is what they are selling here today.

We need to work on a budget for the people. This is the people's House. That is why they voted for us to come to Congress. Let's focus on the real issues and not play into the political theater that is being offered here today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the bill in front of us, in some ways, is a simple bill. It is a continuing resolution. It goes for a certain amount of time. Sadly, it reflects the basic failure of this institution to focus on its job.

We have had more than a year to deal with what we should be dealing with, the passage of the budget. We extended—I actually voted for the extension—the last continuing resolution to provide time.

Now, my friends knew at the beginning of this process the number of things that they had to do. They knew if they took out the Hyde language and those protections that they would never get a deal. Yet, they did that anyway.

They did that without consultation. They did it in committee. They had the votes. They had every right to do it. They also knew at the end of the day they were going to have to have bipartisanship on appropriations bills. They will not pass in the Senate because of the filibuster. There is sufficient support on both sides of the aisle.

Every single Republican in this Chamber actually supported the reinsertion of the Hyde amendment in the legislative process, telling our friends: If you take this out, we are not going to be working with you until it is restored.

So far, we have not seen any effort to do that.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side also put in lots of poison pills—again, lots of things that they knew Republicans would not accept. That is fine in a reconciliation package. They really don't need our votes. That is not true in an appropriations bill.

It is my understanding that both ranking members in both Chambers on the Committee on Appropriations said: Look, we are not sitting down to negotiate until the Hyde protections are back in.

They are historically bipartisan. They have been there 45 years. Most of my friends on the other side of the aisle have voted for them over and over and over again, whether they liked them or not.

Frankly, if you are going to have to get a bipartisan deal, when you put partisan pills in, you know you are going to have to take them out at some point. You might as well do it at the beginning of the session.

We also have had no engagement from either the administration or our friends on the other side about any spending limits whatsoever. What is our top-line number? Nobody has been willing to sit down and talk about that. Quite frankly, that is a problem.

Mr. Speaker, we probably ought to be looking at that, as we have done in previous years over multiple years going forward. We could also make adjustments if we are in a crisis. We have done that before. But we had a framework that we could operate under, and it has actually facilitated the appropriations. I would recommend to my friends that might be something they want to talk about with both sides.

But in the end, the deal here is not hard to see. The deal involves three simple things. There are lots of details, lots of other things to be negotiated.

First, defense spending is going to have to come up. That is not just Republicans telling you that. The Democratic-controlled House Committee on Armed Services and the Democratic-controlled Senate Committee on Armed Services both put in \$25 billion more than in the President's base budget or in the bill that our friends passed out of committee but never brought to this floor because they don't have the votes to pass it. So that is one.

Number two, my friends, in the 12 bills that they have passed through the Committee on Appropriations—and I commend them for that—raised domestic spending by 17 or 18 percent. That number is going to have to come down. We can talk about how much, and we can talk about where, but it is way too much, and it is way out of balance.

And number three—and my friends were told this over and over and over again—if you take out the Hyde protections on life, there will be no Republican votes for your bill. Now, we can pass continuing resolution after continuing resolution. After all, that is Donald Trump's last negotiated budget, the budget you got when you had a Republican President, Republican Senate, and a Democratic House.

Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, many of my friends on my side of the aisle would prefer that. I would prefer a deal. I would prefer a more robust defense budget. I am willing to talk about some of my friends' domestic priorities—quite frankly, some of which I share and would support and have in the past. I am also, though, not prepared to yield on the Hyde amendment, and my friends know that.

Mr. Speaker, we know what a deal is: more defense; less domestic spending; removal of poison pills; restoration of historic, bipartisan protections on life. Do those things and we can have a deal, I think, pretty quickly. Stay where you are at and we will not have a deal, and we will be right back here in February, doing another continuing resolution.

The most basic responsibility of Congress is to fund the government. Unfortunately, we are no closer to a full-

year spending deal that we truly need. My colleagues in the majority have wasted months focusing on other matters—notably, a wildly expensive and unrealistic reconciliation spending package—rather than doing the hard and essential work of governing the Nation. I urge my friends in the majority to rethink that course.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and “no” on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Roy).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 200, nays 224, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

YEAS—200

Aderholt	Fallon	Joyce (OH)
Allen	Feenstra	Joyce (PA)
Amodei	Ferguson	Katko
Armstrong	Fischbach	Keller
Arrington	Fitzgerald	Kelly (MS)
Babin	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Bacon	Fleischmann	Kustoff
Baird	Fortenberry	LaHood
Balderson	Fox	LaMalfa
Banks	Franklin, C.	Lamborn
Barr	Scott	Latta
Bentz	Fulcher	LaTurner
Bergman	Gaetz	Lesko
Bice (OK)	Gallagher	Letlow
Biggs	Garbarino	Long
Bilirakis	Garcia (CA)	Loudermilk
Bishop (NC)	Gibbs	Lucas
Boebert	Gimenez	Luetkemeyer
Bost	Gohmert	Mace
Brady	Gonzales, Tony	Malliotakis
Brooks	Gonzalez (OH)	Mann
Buchanan	Good (VA)	Mast
Buck	Gooden (TX)	McCarthy
Bucshon	Gosar	McCaul
Budd	Granger	McClain
Burchett	Graves (LA)	McClintock
Burgess	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Calvert	Greene (GA)	McKinley
Cammack	Griffith	Meijer
Carey	Grothman	Meuser
Carl	Guest	Miller (IL)
Carter (GA)	Guthrie	Miller (WV)
Carter (TX)	Hagedorn	Miller-Meeks
Cawthorn	Harris	Moolenaar
Chabot	Harshbarger	Moore (AL)
Cline	Hartzler	Mullin
Cloud	Hern	Newhouse
Clyde	Herrell	Norman
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Nunes
Comer	Hice (GA)	Oberholte
Crawford	Higgins (LA)	Owens
Crenshaw	Hill	Palazzo
Curtis	Hinson	Palmer
Davidson	Hollingsworth	Pence
Davis, Rodney	Hudson	Perry
DesJarlais	Huizenga	Pfleger
Diaz-Balart	Issa	Posey
Donalds	Jackson	Reed
Duncan	Jacobs (NY)	Rice (SC)
Dunn	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Ellzey	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Emmer	Johnson (SD)	Rose
Estes	Jordan	Rosendale

Rouzer	Steel
Roy	Stefanik
Rutherford	Steil
Salazar	Steube
Scalise	Stewart
Schweikert	Taylor
Scott, Austin	Tenney
Sessions	Thompson (PA)
Smith (MO)	Tiffany
Smith (NE)	Timmons
Smith (NJ)	Turner
Smucker	Upton
Spartz	Valadao
Stauber	Van Drew

NAYS—224

Adams	Gonzalez,	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Vicente	Pallone
Allred	Gottheimer	Panetta
Auchincloss	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Axne	Grijalva	Pascarell
Barragán	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bass	Hayes	Perlmutter
Beatty	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Bera	Himes	Phillips
Beyer	Horsford	Pingree
Bishop (GA)	Houlahan	Pocan
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Porter
Blunt Rochester	Huffman	Pressley
Bonamici	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Bourdeaux	Jacobs (CA)	Quigley
Bowman	Jayapal	Raskin
Boyle, Brendan	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
F.	Johnson (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Brown (MD)	Johnson (TX)	Ross
Brown (OH)	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Brownley	Kahele	Ruiz
Bush	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Bustos	Keating	Rush
Butterfield	Kelly (IL)	Ryan
Carbajal	Khanna	Sánchez
Cárdenas	Kildee	Sarbanes
Carson	Kilmer	Scanlon
Carter (LA)	Kim (CA)	Schakowsky
Cartwright	Kim (NJ)	Schiff
Case	Kind	Schneider
Casten	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Castor (FL)	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier
Castro (TX)	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Chu	Lamb	Scott, David
Cicilline	Langevin	Sewell
Clark (MA)	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Clarke (NY)	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
Cleaver	Lawrence	Simpson
Clyburn	Lawson (FL)	Sires
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Slotkin
Connolly	Lee (NV)	Smith (WA)
Cooper	Leger Fernandez	Soto
Correa	Levin (CA)	Speier
Costa	Levin (MI)	Stansbury
Courtney	Lieu	Stanton
Craig	Lofgren	Stevens
Crist	Lowenthal	Strickland
Crow	Luria	Suozzi
Cuellar	Lynch	Swalwell
Davids (KS)	Malinowski	Takano
Davis, Danny K.	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Dean	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Maloney, Sean	Titus
DeGette	Manning	Tlaib
DeLauro	Matsui	Tonko
DeBene	McBath	Torres (CA)
Delgado	McCollum	Torres (NY)
Demings	McEachin	Trahan
DeSaulnier	McGovern	Trone
Deutch	McNerney	Underwood
Dingell	Meeks	Vargas
Doggett	Meng	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	Mfume	Vela
F.	Moore (UT)	Velázquez
Escobar	Moore (WI)	Wasserman
Eshoo	Morelle	Schultz
Esparilla	Moulton	Waters
Evans	Mrvan	Watson Coleman
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Foster	Murphy (NC)	Wexton
Frankel, Lois	Nadler	Wild
Gallego	Napolitano	Williams (GA)
Garamendi	Neal	Wilson (FL)
García (IL)	Neguse	Yarmuth
García (TX)	Newman	Young
Golden	Norcross	
Gomez	O'Halleran	

NOT VOTING—9

Cheney	Massie	Omar
Green (TN)	Mooney	Reschenthaler
Kinzinger	Nehls	Spanberger

□ 1347

Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Messrs. GRIJALVA, CUELLER, DOGGETT, JEFFRIES, BOWMAN, COURTNEY, VARGAS, SCOTT of Virginia, Mses. NEWMAN, KAPTUR, MOORE of Wisconsin, ESHOO, SCANLON, BASS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SUOZZI changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. CRENSHAW, WITTMAN, FERGUSON, LONG, MULLIN, BACON, and GARCIA of California changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Messrs. O'HALLERAN and PERLMUTTER changed their vote from “present” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Brown	Lawson (FL)	Rush (Quigley)
(MD))	(Evans)	Sires (Pallone)
Cárdenas (Soto)	Lesko (Miller	Stewart (Owens)
Crist	(WV))	Swalwell
(Wasserman	Meng (Kuster)	(Gomez)
Schultz)	Moore (UT)	Takano (Chu)
Curtis (Meijer)	(Owens)	Tiffany
DeFazio	Palazzo	(Arrington)
(Carbajal)	(Fleischmann)	Underwood
Fulcher (Johnson	Payne (Pallone)	(Casten)
(OH))	Porter (Wexton)	Vela (Gomez)
Hagedorn	Posey	Watson Coleman
(Moolenaar)	(Cammack)	(Pallone)
Kildee (Ryan)	Reed (Kelly	Wilson (FL)
Lawrence	(PA))	(Hayes)
(Johnson (GA))	Ruiz (Aguilar)	

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6119, FURTHER EXTENDING GOVERNMENT FUNDING ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). The gentleman from Oklahoma has yielded back. The gentleman from California is recognized to close.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have just witnessed, once again, that the other side of the aisle has zero—zero—interest in governing. Zero. Republicans apparently have no interest in leading and zero—no agenda on how to lead. Zero.

Meanwhile, Democrats are trying to make sure that the programs that our constituents depend on will be able to continue. Democrats are trying to make sure that our troops—you know, the ones that you claim to support—have the resources to defend our country, to defend the Constitution that you have sworn to defend.

Democrats are trying to make sure that our hospitals and our health clinics have the resources to help those who are sick with COVID. You can boo all you want, but many of you have continued to spread this pandemic by refusing to wear a mask.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, we are seeing a full display of